



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

SW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/016,508	12/10/2001	Miguel N. Bermudez	042390P11384D	1145

7590

03/15/2004

Todd M. Becker
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

HENDERSON, MARK T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3722

14

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/016,508

Applicant(s)

BERMUDEZ, MIGUEL N.

Examiner

Mark T Henderson

Art Unit

3722

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 February 2004.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,7,8,19 and 21-38 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,7,8,19 and 21-38 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3722

DETAILED ACTION

Faxing of Responses to Office Actions

In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, TC 3700 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Group at (703)872-9302 (Official) and (703)872-9303 (for After Finals). This practice may be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into TC 3700 will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.

Request for Continued Examination

1. The request filed on February 9, 2004 for a Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 based on parent Application No. 10/016,508 is acceptable and an RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

Art Unit: 3722

2. Claims 2, 6, 9, 10-18 and 20 have been canceled. Claims 1 and 19 have been amended for further examination. Claims 27-38 have been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 19, 27 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. In regards to Claims 1, 19, 27, and 33 it is not understood what is meant by “uniquely identifies”. Applicant must disclose how this method of identifying is “unique” from any other identifying method.

4. In regards to Claims 19 and 33, it is not understood how “first and second identification label” are removably attached to a “designated area”, wherein the “designated area” can only receive an identification label (which means one label, as stated on line 2). Are there three labels (an identification label, and first and second identification labels on the “designated area”, or is it just the “first and second identification label”?

Art Unit: 3722

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 1, 3-5, and 19, 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laurash et al (5,704,650) in view of Kelly, Jr and further in view of Blankenship et al (6,536,660).

Laurash et al discloses in Fig. 1, 4 and 5, an article comprising: first identification label (26) and second identification label (29), and a base label (20, as seen in Fig. 2); wherein each identification label has a printed indicied identifier (56, as stated in Col. 7, lines 10-15, which can be in a combination of human readable and machine readable form; and wherein the first and second identification labels are removably fixed from an object's surface (Col. 7, lines 57-63, which can be a container) and attached to any other desirable surface (Col. 8, lines 1-5, which can be a device).

However, Laurash et al does not disclose: an object being a component container; an identifier that identifies a component inside the component container; and wherein the identifier indicia is electronically stored in the component and read therefrom for printing labels.

Art Unit: 3722

Kelly, Jr. discloses an object being a component container (24) having components (20) and a device (contents inside component box (20)), wherein a label (30) is removably affixed to the component container, and has an identifier (bar code 42) that identifies the component inside the container.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Laurash et al's label to include a label having an identifier which identifies the components inside of a container, as taught by Kelly, Jr. for the purpose of keeping an inventory record.

However, Laurash et al as modified by Kelly, Jr. does not disclose: wherein the identifier is electronically stored in the component and read from the component and printed on the labels.

Blankenship et al discloses in Fig. 1-5, an identifier which can be electronically stored on a component (in this case encoding by imprinting magnetic impulses on a wire), and read (by using the Hall effect), and placed as a bar code on an adhesive label (Col. 3, lines 3-33), and wherein the adhesive label is placed on any desirable surface such as a container (reel or barrel for holding wire).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Laurash et al's article with an identifier that is electronically stored in a component as taught by Blankenship et al for the purpose of providing an identification means having greater security.

Art Unit: 3722

However, Laurash et al as modified by Kelly, Jr and Blankenship et al does not disclose: wherein the identifier is read and printed on labels.

Christopher et al discloses in Col. 3, lines 60-68, and Col. 4, lines 1-4, an identifier (code printed on scanned records) which is read and in turn prints desired information associated with the identifier on a label (by a scanner/ labeler, 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Laurash et al's article with an identifier which can be read and be printed out on labels through the use of a scanner/labeler as taught by Christopher et al for the purpose of accurately identifying the component and eliminating human error that may result form improper identification of the component.

In regards to **Claims 3, 4, 21 and 22**, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the first and second label at any desirable location, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. Applicant has not disclosed the location of the labels is critical to his invention, and the invention would work equally as well with the labels in an alternative position.

6. Claims 7, 8, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over in Laurash et al as modified by Kelly, Jr, Blankenship et al and Christopher et al, and further in view of Brower et al (6,348,685).

Art Unit: 3722

Laurash et al as modified by Kelly, Blankenship et al and Christopher et al discloses an article comprising all the elements as disclosed in Claims 1 and 19, and as set forth above.

However, Laurash et al, Kelly and Blankenship et al do not disclose: wherein the container object is constructed of polyester and is a electrostatic discharge bag.

Brower et al discloses in Fig. 9, an polymeric material (polyester) electrostatic discharge bag (14) container object.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Laurash et al's object with an electrostatic bag object as taught by Brower et al for the purpose of holding electronic equipment.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 27 and 33 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

8. Claims 28-32 and 34-38 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 3722

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed on August 18, 2003, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regards to applicant's argument and amendment that the Laurash and Kelly do not disclose an "identifier electronically stored in the component and read therefrom and printed on labels", the examiner submits that the Blankenship et al and Christopher et al references are relied upon for further disclosing these limitations.


Prior Art References

The prior art references listed in the attached PTO-892, but not used in a rejection of the claims, are cited for (their/its) structure. Fendt et al, Dickinson, Boriani, Seki, Griffis et al, disclose similar articles of manufacture.

Art Unit: 3722


Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark T. Henderson whose telephone number is (703)305-0189. The examiner can be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:30 AM to 3:45 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner supervisor, A. L. Wellington, can be reached on (703) 308-2159. The fax number for TC 3700 is (703)-872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 3700 receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1148.



MTH

March 7, 2004



A. L. WELLINGTON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700